



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/635,911

08/10/2000

Badri N. Prasad

6759

6357

25763

7590

08/22/2006

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
SUITE 1500  
50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498

EXAMINER

BLECK, CAROLYN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/635,911

Applicant(s)

PRASAD ET AL.

Examiner

Carolyn M. Bleck

Art Unit

3626

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 101.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

102

Applicant argues that Lash fails to teach "a plurality of utilization scores is computed that correspond to each of a plurality of members in a health plan."

In response, it is respectfully submitted that Lash teaches Applicant's claimed invention. First, Lash teaches "applying the claims data for at least one of the patient records to the probability equation to assign a score to the patient record based on the result of the probability equation" (See claim 1 of Lash). For example, if there were two members in a health plan, then Lash would teach computing a score for those members. This would be a form of "each of a plurality of members in a health plan."

Second, Applicant asserts that Lash only analyzes a subset of the members in a managed care organization, whereas Applicant's invention does not use a subset of patient data. It appears to the Examiner that Applicant is also analyzing a subset of patient data. For example, at page 20 of Applicant's specification, Applicant discusses that CCGs only classify claims that result from a fact-to-face encounter between a provider and a member. Further, Applicant discusses at page 17 that "The burden of illness portion of the scoring calculation is represented by the BOI data file 120. The BOI data file 120 contains a number for each plan member that measures the quantity of disease operative in the member as derived from claims data (some combination of medical claims and pharmacy claims submitted for the plan member during the base period)." It appears that this BOI score is based on claims from a base period. If a particular patient does not have any claims filed during a base period of time, then no BOI score would be calculated. Thus, it appears that when Applicant claims that a utilization score is being calculated for "each of a plurality of members of a health plan," Applicant is actually calculating scores for members who have claim data for a particular base period. If no data is available, then a score would not be calculated. Thus, both Applicant and Lash are calculating scores based on a subset of data, and it is not clear what the patentable distinction is between Lash and Applicant's invention.